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Abstract

This study traces the development of Lincoln Center Institute (LCI) from its inception in 1974 to the present day. There is a discussion of the emergence of Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts in the 1950s and the constituent groups that helped make its foundation possible. Next, the study recounts the early history of the Student Program, the first education program at Lincoln Center. There is an exploration of the initial leadership by Mark Schubart, and his early collaboration with Maxine Greene, whose work focused on educational philosophy and aesthetic education.

As Lincoln Center Institute developed, it focused on bringing its philosophy of aesthetic education into schools through LCI-trained teaching artists. A Summer Session was established to immerse classroom teachers and school administrators in aesthetic education, and “The Capacities for Imaginative Learning” were created to make aesthetic education viable in all classrooms. Partnerships with several colleges were established to work with pre-service teachers. A re-naming occurred in 2013; LCI is now one division of Lincoln Center Education.
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A Study of Lincoln Center Institute

Introduction

This study traces the earliest development and continued growth of Lincoln Center Institute (LCI). LCI is an institution that advocates the incorporation of performing arts in mainstream education. The study is organized chronologically, beginning with an account of the formation of Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts. Following this is a description of first educational program, the Lincoln Center Student Program. The next section discusses the development of the Institute. Finally, the study investigates the current plans for Lincoln Center Education. The study concludes with the key understandings gained from this research.

development of the study. This study emerged out of a desire to learn more about Lincoln Center Institute. The author was familiar with the Institute, having been introduced in one of her classes at Bank Street College. It was clear that LCI was an arts education organization, and that it worked with public schools in New York City and the surrounding areas. It was also evident how LCI’s programming in schools functioned, through the use of specifically trained Teaching Artists who worked with classroom teachers and their students to engage them in activities related to a work of art.

What was not apparent, however, was how the Institute developed. Therefore, it became necessary to trace the beginnings of LCI and even the foundations Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts. As the study evolved, it became more about the rich history involved in the creation of LCI and less about LCI’s programming. LCI developed over time and emerged out of a series of events. It is impossible to understand the current state of this institution without learning the history of its past.
**emergent questions.** Several emergent questions have guided this study. They came about because of the author’s interest in learning more about Lincoln Center Institute. These questions include:

1.) How did Lincoln Center Institute begin and what was its original mission?

2.) What are some of the significant changes that have emerged over the past 40 years?

3.) What was the impact of the institute’s collaboration with Maxine Greene and her philosophy of aesthetic education?

4.) What is the significance of the role of the teaching artist in this educational program?

5.) What is the nature of the relationship between LCI, schools and teachers?

6.) How is LCI funded so it can carry out its goals?
The Origins of Lincoln Center Institute (1955-1974)

Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts. The formation of Lincoln Center developed from a vision held by a group of wealthy civic leaders in the 1950s. This group was lead by John D. Rockefeller 3rd and included Charles M. Spofford, Anthony A. Bliss, Floyd Blair, Arthur A. Houghton, Jr., and Wallace K. Harrison (Rich, 1984, p. 17). “The Exploratory Team,” as they called themselves, wanted to create a cultural institution focused on the advancement of the arts. They envisioned Lincoln Center as a place that people could attend performances not just for entertainment, but as a source for “well-being and happiness” (Rockefeller, 1970 as cited in Stamas & Zane, 2007, p. 1). They also wanted Lincoln Center to serve the community and be accessible to all people, not just the “privileged few” (Rockefeller, 1970 as cited in Rich, 1984, p. 9).

In addition to the hard-working and devoted group who rallied for Lincoln Center’s creation, there were three additional factors that allowed the center to become a reality. The first was governmental. In the mid-1950s, New York City was undergoing several urban renewal projects intended to re-develop neighborhoods. Robert Moses led the Committee on Slum Clearance, which in 1954 determined that seventeen blocks on the Upper West Side would be designated for the Lincoln Square Urban Renewal Project. According to Young (1980), who held a variety of roles at Lincoln Center including Executive Vice President and Chairman of the Building Committee, Moses originally saw the redesign including commercial and cooperative real estate development, middle-income housing, a university center, a public park, stores, new theatres, and an opera house (p. 11-12).

The second factor that allowed for the creation of Lincoln Center was that the
Board of Directors at the Metropolitan Opera was in the process of searching for a place to build a new opera house. The opera’s current location near Times Square was deteriorating and there was a lack of storage space for sets and costumes. According to Rich (1984), when Moses and his friend, architect Wallace K. Harrison, attended a meeting with the board of the Metropolitan Opera, the idea for the opera to move to Lincoln Center was appealing to everyone. After a failed attempt at relocating the opera to Rockefeller Center, this was just the opportunity the board of the Metropolitan Opera was looking for.

Finally, the third factor that allowed for Lincoln Center’s development was the Board of Directors of the New York Philharmonic were also searching for a new venue. They performed at Carnegie Hall, which was scheduled to close after the Philharmonic’s 1959 season. Ironically, Rich (1984) told how the board of the Philharmonic had previously approached Harrison for his ideas on how to build a music hall for the symphony. With the knowledge that the Philharmonic was looking to build a new performance space, Harrison recommended the possibility of breaking ground at Lincoln Square.

At this point, two major arts organizations were on board to relocate their artistic homes to Lincoln Square. They were also both planning on raising funds to build new performance spaces, an opera house and a music hall. It suddenly become clear to Robert Moses and other members of the Metropolitan Opera Board that Lincoln Square could become, in the words of Rich (1984), a “full-scale center for the arts with several buildings and a consortium of performing organizations, all linked in a corporate identity that might be a more potent fund-raising force than any single constituent” (p. 17). Thus,
the idea for Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts was confirmed.

Beginning in 1955, the “Exploratory Committee,” led by Rockefeller, started meeting to discuss plans for the Center. One of the major questions that needed to be answered was, “How would the ambitious center be financed?” Young (1980) mentioned that the founders considered two historic facts about funding in the performing arts:

One, recognition that the arts are inherently a deficit operation and require a substantial subsidy beyond any reasonable expectation of income from ticket sales. Second, American tradition expected this subsidy to come primarily from private, voluntary contributions and not from the government (p. 29).

Rich (1984) also discussed these traditional ideas of American thinking in relation to the arts by comparing the model of artistic financing in Europe, where in France for example, it is illegal to donate any personal funds to the Paris Opera (p. 73). Therefore, the primary means of financing Lincoln Center was through the private sector – wealthy individuals and corporations who were passionate about the arts and believed in the mission of creating a high-quality arts institution for all people to benefit from and enjoy.

**additional organizations join Lincoln Center.** The idea of including arts education at Lincoln Center was first raised in 1955 at one of the early meetings held by the Exploratory Committee (Young, 1980, p. 23). As soon as it was clear that the Metropolitan Opera and the New York Philharmonic were, in fact, going to be the founding organizations of Lincoln Center, the Exploratory Committee wanted to secure an affiliation with an educational institution. They envisioned a school that would provide professional training for young artists in all of the performing arts disciplines - music, voice, dance, and drama. Young (1980) recounted that the school “would include a workshop approach to bridge the gap between formal training and performance” (p. 55).
In 1955 the founders of Lincoln Center approached The Juilliard School, which at the time was a music school devoted entirely to vocal and instrumental training. One of the members of the Exploratory Committee, Spofford, was also a trustee at Juilliard and he thought the school might be interested in partnering with Lincoln Center. However, according to Young (1980) the Board of Directors of The Juilliard School were hesitant to join the growing cultural institution because they were unsure about expanding to include new art forms in their curriculum. However, William Schuman, the President of The Juilliard School, supported the ideas that Lincoln Center put forth, and he urged the board to reconsider. In 1957, The Juilliard School became the third organization to join Lincoln Center, which also allowed for Schuman to become a member of the Lincoln Center Board of Directors.

At this point, Lincoln Center had three member organizations: the Metropolitan Opera, the New York Philharmonic, and The Juilliard School. However, the founders of Lincoln Center were anxious to grow the list of resident organizations, particularly in theater and dance. According to Young (1980), the Repertory Theater Association joined Lincoln Center in 1960, although this relationship later ended. In 1963, The New York City Ballet became the dance constituent, committing to a twenty-week season each year at the New York State Theatre (Rich, 1984). The rest of the Lincoln Center constituents currently include: the Chamber Music Society of Lincoln Center, the Film Society of Lincoln Center, Jazz at Lincoln Center, Lincoln Center Theatre, the New York Public Library for the Performing Arts, and the School of American Ballet.

Each organization that joined Lincoln Center had its own board of directors and was responsible for its own financial and artistic integrity. However, by being associated
with Lincoln Center, every company benefited from institutional fundraising campaigns and public awareness of the high artistic standards set by Lincoln Center. Martin E. Segal, the Chairman of Lincoln Center’s Board in 1984 said:

“It is our job to attempt to do for each constituent whatever it can’t do for itself, or what a central organization can do better for all. For example, we raise money from the corporate sector to help with the operating expenses of each of the constituents, making a single appeal for all (Rich, 1984, p. 108).

In order to make sure that each resident artistic company was involved in governing Lincoln Center, Young (1980) explained that every constituent had a representative (or two depending on the size of the organization) serve on the Lincoln Center Board of Directors (p. 52).

Mark Schubart and the Lincoln Center Student Program. In the summer of 1960, before construction on the first building at Lincoln Center was complete, there was discussion about beginning an educational program. Young (1980) recounted that some members of the Lincoln Center Board “sensed an opportunity for the Center to enable more young people to experience the arts of live performance” (p. 232). To answer this call, Lincoln Center developed its first educational program, the Lincoln Center Student Program.

The goal for the Student Program was to provide opportunities for students to experience live performances. There were two ways this was accomplished: the artists from Lincoln Center’s organizations performed at schools, and the schools took field trips to Lincoln Center to see shows given by the various companies. Young (1980) discussed how curriculum materials and teaching guides were developed for teachers to use in the classroom with their students in preparation to see the live performances. It was hoped that these materials, which provided details about the art form, the artists, and
the artistic company, would help the students understand, enjoy, and appreciate the work of art.

The Lincoln Center Student Program was very different from The Juilliard School. While they both focused on arts education, the type of education was drastically different. Young (1980) wrote, “Unlike the Julliard School, whose educational focus was the professional training of young artists, the Student Program was an effort to provide opportunities for large numbers of young people to be exposed to the enjoyment of all the performing arts” (p. 232). The emergence of two education initiatives associated with Lincoln Center signified that education was a top priority of the cultural institution. The training of serious artists was one critical component, while the other was to provide arts education to students in public schools who were not preparing for professional careers in the arts.

In 1962, William Schuman, the President of The Juilliard School, was appointed to the President of Lincoln Center. He was chosen for the position for two reasons. First, he had successfully managed The Juilliard School for nearly two decades. Second, according to Rich (1984) Schuman was known as “a major American composer” (p. 27), and therefore understood the complex intricacies of being an artist. The Board of Lincoln Center agreed that selecting someone who was both an excellent administrator as well as a prolific artist would be beneficial in guiding the institution forward.

The next year, in 1963, Schuman appointed Mark Schubart to be the Director of Education at Lincoln Center, in charge of running the Student Program. Schuman and Schubart had worked together at The Julliard School, where Schubart was Dean and then later Vice President. During his time at Juilliard, Schubart had been involved in the
Student Program, so he was already familiar with it when he was appointed Director. Schuman believed Schubart would be able to guide the Student Program as it continued to grow. According to Noppe-Brandon, who later held a variety of positions at Lincoln Center Institute, including Executive Director, Schubart left Juilliard because “he wanted a new challenge, but he still wanted to be involved in the arts and to aid in providing arts education to people” (S. Noppe-Brandon, personal communication, December 13, 2013).

Under Schubart’s direction, the Student Program continued thriving. According to Young (1980), annually, it was reaching about 150,000 students in 150 schools in New York City and the surrounding suburbs (p. 233). This was in part due to the involvement of Lincoln Center’s artistic companies. Without them, the type of high quality arts exposure provided to students through the Student Program would not have been possible. And without Lincoln Center, as Young (1980) said, “acting as catalyst and coordinator,” the constituents would not have been able to each support education initiatives with the size or impact of the Student Program (p. 233).

In order to organize the participating institutions in the Student Program, the Lincoln Center Council on Educational Programs was established in 1964. Young (1980) said the goal of the Council was to “foster the cooperative atmosphere surrounding the Student Program” (p. 233). Schubart (1972) recounted how the Council also allowed for the constituents to create policies of the program together as a group. The most significant of these were that the efforts of the Student Program would be focused on developing new audiences and that the program would work with students in junior and senior high schools (p. 5-6).

The Student Program was also successful because of the funding it received. Rich
(1984) explained how the founders of Lincoln Center created a Fund for Education and Creative Artistic Advancement. This endowment, to be used specifically for education, quickly reached half of its $10 million goal. Then, according to Young (1980), a few years later Mr. and Mrs. Van Allen Clark gave $1,169,000 to the Fund for Education, at the time the single largest contribution. The Clarks continued donating to the fund annually, making them the most active supporters of the Lincoln Center Student Program.

Finally, the Student Program flourished because of the support from both the Commissioner of Education for the State of New York, and the New York City Superintendent. Young (1980) said they each “endorsed the program and authorized local schools to include, in their official budgets, items to cover the costs of the artist fees for performances in the schools” (p. 233). In fact, Schubart (1972) wrote that the Student Program was approved by the state as a “curriculum-related activity” (p. 6). Hence, the financing of the Student Program was twofold – from private donors and also from the school districts. Even though there was little monetary input from the government in the financing of Lincoln Center, in terms of education, government agencies authorized the use of school funds toward the Student Program. This was important because the public schools were saying that arts education was necessary for students.

In the summer of 1968, Lincoln Center encountered some financial difficulties. According to Young (1980) Lincoln Center’s summer programming cost more to produce than planned, which put the center in danger of bankruptcy (p. 296). This led to tension among the resident organizations. However, participation in the Student Program became a uniting factor. Young recounted that by the end of the decade, the Student Program was reaching more than 1 million students each year, and financially, public
funding for programming was “twice that of Lincoln Center’s costs” (p. 297). At a time when the Lincoln Center Board was cutting operating expenses, they left the Student Program intact because it was sustaining itself. This was the brilliance of having created a separate fund for education.

**The Hunting of the Squiggle study.** The Student Program continued its success for over a decade, into the early 1970s. However, according to Stamas and Zane (2007) Schubart was “increasingly troubled by what he saw as the program’s inability to touch young people” (p. 101). Up to this point, the Student Program had always operated on the assumption that by exposing students to the arts, they would get something out of their experience. However, Schubart and the Council on Educational Programs began wondering what students were specifically learning as a result of their time spent with art. Schubart (1972) grouped their questions into six categories: how to reach the most students, the choice of repertory, the artist-student relationship, the teaching process, the relationship between Lincoln Center and the schools, and the evaluation of programming (p. 10).

Clearly, Schubart was interested in launching a serious study. This would require funding and time off from running the Student Program. Therefore, Schubart approached Schuman, the President of Lincoln Center, and discussed his concerns about the Student Program, which mostly involved arts exposure for students and future audience development for the resident organizations that participated. Schubart explained to Schuman that he wanted to assess how these objectives affected young people, and if they were thorough enough to account for the educational programming at the world’s most prominent arts center. Schuman was supportive and helped secure funding from the
Carnegie Corporation (Schubart, 1972). Schubart’s staff continued running the Student Program, while he and a small team conducted research for the study.

The findings of the year-long study were published by Lincoln Center in 1972 in a document called, *The Hunting of the Squiggle: A Study of Performing Arts Institutions and Young People*. It was the first study of its kind because it investigated the content and philosophy of arts education programs. According to Schubart (1972) previous studies conducted at arts institutions only involved calculating the number of students participating and the cost of running the programs (p. 27).

The study was comprehensive and utilized several methods of investigation. Schubart (1972) recounted that over 5,000 questionnaires were sent to a variety of groups including artists, arts institutions, state arts councils, community agencies, and secondary school humanities programs. Additionally, interviews were conducted with artists, educational leaders, community leaders, and trustees and management of arts institutions. The Juilliard Drama Division completed a thorough evaluation of twenty-five theater, puppet, and music shows for students in New York City. There were studies in different regions about informal community arts activities, as well as, interviews conducted at national education conventions (p. 91-95). Finally, there was a weekend retreat of artists and educators held in Westchester, New York that became known as the “Pound Ridge Affair.” Schubart explained that the group gathered to informally discuss the results of the study, while adding their opinions and experiences to the conversation on determining the best way to help young people develop an “ability to perceive and respond to artistic experience” (p. 20). Overall, about 200 education programs at arts institutions around the country were examined in the study.
In the United States, there are many arts institutions that produce education programs. According to Schubart (1972), however, these institutions have “widely varying degrees of success” (p. 3). This is because most Americans find education a worthy cause of donation:

Among large segments of our citizenry there is the uneasy feeling that the performing arts really are entertainment and, as such, are not altogether deserving of public or philanthropic support - or that they rate only the lowest of priorities on the scale of human needs. The fact that an arts institution serves, or purports to serve, a genuinely educative function, that it actually ‘does things for young people,’ helps to dissipate this uneasiness by putting the artist into the same category of acceptability as the educator or the social worker. By playing this role, the arts institution earns the right to philanthropic dollars it could not otherwise claim (Schubart, 1972, p. 3-4).

In this way, many arts institutions easily receive funding for their education programs.

However, Schubart’s study also exposed that many education initiatives were falling short because they had unclear goals surrounding the youth with which they worked. Therefore, Schubart and his team generated two specific objectives for all education programs operated by arts institutions to focus on in their work with students. These goals were not about simple exposure and audience development. Rather, they delved deeper into what young people should learn as a result of their experiences with art. Schubart (1972) wrote that the first goal was to encourage “the development among young people of the ability to perceive and understand the artistic experience” (p. 14). The second goal was to “help develop among young people the ability to determine, on the basis of understanding and perception, what kinds of artistic expression and activity – formal and informal – are to be part of their lives” (p. 14).

Schubart’s (1972) study also found the majority of art for students consisted of “second-rate performances of third-rate material” (p. 78). Additionally, the study
revealed a serious deficit in the amount of quality art offerings created for young people. Finally, many instances proved that youngsters were being exposed to art that was created for adults, which was developmentally inappropriate. Therefore, there needed to be artwork created specifically for students so they could have a meaningful experience in their interactions.

If the goal was to educate young people through the arts, the study argued that a new organization needed to be developed. Schubart (1972) was so convinced that a new structure was necessary that he gave it a theoretical title, “The Lincoln Center Project for Young People,” with hopes that it would one day become a reality (p. 77). Schubart and the findings from the Squiggle study were featured on the front page of the New York Times. Montgomery (1972) explained the idea for the new organization:

There would be de-emphasis of presentation of recognized works in a formal setting, which now makes up the bulk of what passes for youth programs. Instead, there would be smaller informal projects, involving artists, which would attempt to form basic esthetic perceptions in the young (p. 1, 46).

The new organization would utilize the expertise of artists in the process of teaching students valuable skills that could be gained from studying the arts.

Montgomery’s (1972) article also described Schubart’s thoughts regarding curriculum in the new organization. The picture of arts education in the Student Program was juxtaposed against Lincoln Center’s potential new program as seen in the study:

For example, a typical arts program now might involve seeing a performance or an opera. In preparation, the students might learn what story it tells and how some of its musical effects are made. In the new organization, the students might compose their own opera, perform it and record it, criticize it and then re-write (p. 46).

In this example, the idea for the new organization was that students would be challenged to learn by becoming involved in the process of art making. The hope was that, as a
result, they might begin looking at things differently than they had before; they might start observing details and asking specific questions.

Schubart openly admitted that re-structuring the Student Program, which had been flourishing, in order to focus on education was a risk. Schubart told Montgomery (1972): “[It] is a fairly daring position to take, because once [students] learn, they may wind up feeling that what we’re presenting to them at our theatres is not for them” (p. 46). Hence, the new educational program would not be about new audience creation and retention at all. Rather, Schubart said, it would be about “art directed as much at education as at performance” (Montgomery, 1972, p. 46).

Another result of the study was that in order to make the new organization’s goals a reality there would need to be more adult participation. Montgomery (1972) said that Schubart intended to bring together a large team - composed of artists, teachers, community leaders, parents and students (p.46) - and involve them all in the new arts organization. Schubart (1972) believed that “only the teacher-artist-student partnership in an on-going learning situation was likely to engender materials and procedures solid enough” to create a substantial arts curriculum (p. 71). Thus, part of the new organization would be devoted to developing the relationship between artists and educators.

Lincoln Center Institute (LCI). Shortly after the study was published in 1972, Schubart approached the Board of Directors at Lincoln Center (Stamas & Zane, 2007). He explained that simply exposing students to the performing arts through the Student Program was not enough to be considered quality arts education. In order to truly educate students through the arts, a new organization would be needed. According to
Stamas and Zane (2007) Schubart asked the board if they would support a new institute that “would train teachers, work with artists interested in educating children, create presentations geared specifically to children, and disseminate its expertise” (p. 102).

In August 1974, the board agreed to a three-year development phase that was called Lincoln Center Institute for the Arts in Education (LCI). The only condition was that Schubart needed to secure outside funds from non-competitive sources, so the new institute would not interfere with Lincoln Center’s resources. When Lincoln Center Institute received its initial funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities, it officially began its three-year trial with the following purpose, as explained by Schubart:

Rather than teaching students how to ‘appreciate’ the arts, we should be focusing on how the arts can help young people discover their own capacities to make aesthetic choices in their lives and ultimately how to exercise their right to decide how their world is to look and sound (Rich, 1984, p. 122).

The structure of Lincoln Center Institute was revolutionary. According to Noppe-Brandon, who would become the next Executive Director of LCI, the institution was deliberately organized so that it was at Lincoln Center, but not of Lincoln Center. This meant that LCI had its own board of directors, was responsible for its finances, including paying monthly rent to Lincoln Center, and had complete artistic autonomy. However, LCI was not a legal entity; it was granted an independent status within Lincoln Center. Noppe-Brandon reflected that “Schubart’s brilliance was in knowing how to create an educational institution that functioned within a cultural center yet was unique onto itself (personal communication, December 13, 2013). The founding of LCI was important because for the first time a cultural institution granted a separate organization to be developed specifically for arts education initiatives.

With the new institute established and its purpose clear, the next step would be
determining an internal structure for how to make its goals a reality. This would require a sound educational philosophy. Since Schubart was not a philosopher or a teacher, he would not be able to create this new organization alone. Because he was an excellent administrator with years of experience, he knew how to assemble a group of intelligent people that were zealous about the arts as they related to education. Noppe-Brandon said that Schubart always saw himself as an “arts administrator and a 3rd chair flautist” and that he was also “passionate about arts education and in making sure that the resources and knowledge of Lincoln Center were being used appropriately” (personal communication, December 13, 2013).

The Development of Lincoln Center Institute (1975-1992)

**emergent partnership with Maxine Greene.** In 1975, a partnership between Lincoln Center Institute and Teachers College, Columbia University was established. It was determined that a member of the Teachers College faculty would serve as the liaison between the two institutions. Maxine Greene, who was a Professor of Philosophy of Education, was appointed as the representative from Teachers College. She was known in the field of education for advocating the importance of arts education in a unique way. When Greene’s partnership with LCI began, she had been on the faculty at Teachers College for a decade and had already written extensively on the topics of art, education and philosophy.

Greene had a major impact on Lincoln Center Institute. Her philosophy of aesthetic education became the backbone for the Institute’s educational philosophy. According to Stamas and Zane (2007) Greene believed that the primary focus of the institute needed to be the development of children and their interaction with the work of
art (p. 103). In fact, Greene (2001) insisted on “personal transactions with actual works of art” (p. x). A video recording, audio recording, or photograph of the work of art would not do. Similarly, discussing the work of art without witnessing it firsthand was not an option. The aesthetic principles that Greene promoted were contingent on a student being able to construct individual meaning from his interactions with the work of art itself, which is why the interaction was a key factor. The work of art had the ability to illicit a range of emotions and thoughts in each student.

**aesthetic education.** The full title of LCI proved the institute’s commitment to aesthetic education. It is Lincoln Center Institute for the Arts in Education, as opposed to Lincoln Center Institute for Arts Education. From its inception, LCI made it clear that it was not an arts education organization, like the Student Program had been. Because of Greene, the new organization would be about the profound learning that happened as a result of engaging with works of art.

Aesthetic education is one branch in the field of aesthetics. Greene (2001) defined aesthetics as “the term used to single out a particular field in philosophy, one concerned about perception, sensation, imagination, and how they relate to knowing, understanding, and feeling the world” (p. 5). The term “aesthetic,” then, Greene said “is the adjective used to describe or single out the mode of experience brought into being by encounters with works of art” (p. 5). Finally, aesthetic education “is a process of educating persons…to accomplish the task of perception from a unique standpoint, against the background of their own personal history,” (p. 55) which leads to a greater understanding of the world and one’s place within it.

There were eight key ideas that Greene (2001) advocated for in aesthetic
education as they related to LCI: one, the understanding that art is created by living beings; two, the quality of the art experience; three, the importance of being present when experiencing art; four, the effort involved in achieving an aesthetic experience; five, the relationship between imagination and aesthetic experience; six, the importance of encountering the same work of art more than once; seven, the difference between art education and aesthetic education; and eight, the importance of aesthetic education in school curriculums.

Greene (2001) stressed the importance that art is created by living beings. In most cases, the artist has the intention of other people witnessing his work. This fact, that art is entirely a human enterprise, makes it particularly well-suited to eliciting aesthetic experiences. Greene believed the reason for this is because art offers visions for us; it connects us with an emotion we have felt or an experience we have gone through. The aesthetic experience that results from encountering a work of art also acknowledges the process, the effort and perhaps even struggle, of the artist during his creation.

Greene taught that the quality of the art experience was crucial in aesthetic education. This notion came from John Dewey, who Greene studied inexhaustibly. Dewey (1938) advocated that a person’s understanding was dependent on the quality of the experience, which always had two aspects: “There is an immediate aspect of agreeableness or disagreeableness, and there is its influence upon later experiences” (p. 27). It is true there might be a variety of reactions to any piece of art. But Dewey concluded that our reactions were heavily influenced by the quality of the work. He also believed this initial experience with it would impact future understandings and perhaps
also future choices. Greene (2001) added that a person’s prior experiences would also influence his reactions to a work of art.

In order to have an aesthetic experience, one must be truly present when witnessing a work of art. Greene (2001) often referred to being present as being in conversation with the artwork (p. 112). This conversation, Greene found, encourages the observer to continually ask questions of the art, which keeps him in a state of wonderment. Aesthetic experience requires giving the work of art our full attention, and not thinking about ordinary concerns as Greene reminisced might include “our grocery lists, our ballet tickets, our babysitters, [or] our parking places” (p. 112).

Being present while attending to a work of art requires effort. Greene (2001) elaborated on this fundamental understanding:

The work or the performance can only emerge as an aesthetic object or event in encounters with some human consciousness. Works of art do not reveal themselves automatically… they have to be achieved. And they are most likely to be achieved by those who know how to notice, how to actively perceive (p.15).

As Greene points out, the work of art must be “achieved.” This implies that being moved by it will take effort, and perhaps even hard work. It also requires honing the skills of perception and observation, so one can glean as much as possible from their artful encounter.

Greene taught that the imagination was one of the most important components to aesthetic education because it could aid in achieving an aesthetic experience. A general definition for imagination is the ability to form pictures in the mind of things not seen or experienced (2014, retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/imagination). Most people associate the imagination with make-believe and creativity. It might even be involved with unique problem-solving.
Greene (2001), however, expanded on this view. She elaborated that, “imagination [was] also the power to mold experience into something new, to create fictive situations” (p. 30). Finally, Greene discussed imagination “as the power - by means of sympathetic feeling – to put oneself in another’s place” (p. 30). Accessing our imagination may teach us how to have empathy for others. This ability of the imagination also allows us to understand the complex issues revealed in the art we encounter.

The next important idea Greene (2001) taught in relation to LCI was the importance of repeat encounters with works of art. She discovered that every artful experience provided the opportunity for a new perspective:

Each time we witness a performance of a play or see a painting exhibition or hear a concert (or visit Paris), we do so at a distinctive stage in our own life histories. Because we are different at different moments of our lives, the works that we encounter can never be precisely the same. Viewed as open possibilities each time we come to them, they will begin to appear as events in the ongoing human career, not objects or sediments, or things (p. 36).

A person’s experience with art changes over time in relationship to his human evolution. Hopefully, his connection with repeated works of art grows deeper each opportunity he has to view them because learning is inexhaustible. Greene desired for a person’s artful experiences to be so significant that they would become a part of his entire being.

Another significant contribution Greene made to Lincoln Center Institute was establishing the distinction between art education and aesthetic education. According to Greene (2001), art education involved students exploring different media – paint, clay, movement and sound, for example. When students were involved in art making, they were learning how to be expressive and how to access their creativity. This experience, however, was only one-dimensional.
In her work with LCI, it was imperative to Greene that students’ experiences with the arts were maximized. She advocated for an aesthetic experience, which would provide more impact than arts education:

‘Aesthetic education’ is an intentional undertaking designed to nurture appreciative, reflective, cultural, participatory engagements with the arts by enabling learners to notice what is there to be noticed, and to lend works of art their lives in such a way that they can achieve them as variously meaningful. When this happens, new connections are made in experience: new patterns are formed, new vistas are opened. Persons see differently; resonate differently (Greene, 2001, p. 6).

Therefore, because of Greene’s intense advocacy of aesthetic education, LCI took the position that it was crucial to give students a multi-faced experience of the arts. By providing an aesthetic experience, students could study art, understand how it was made, question it, and decide how it related to their life.

Both Greene and Schubart emphasized that aesthetic education should be a part of the school curriculum. Greene (2001) pointed out that aesthetic education is the very essence of what many educators feel is important to teach students:

The learning provoked by what we call aesthetic education is paradigmatic for the learning many of us would like to see: learning stimulated by the desire to explore, to find out, to go in search. It is self-initiated, permeated by wonder, studded by moments of questioning. Not only am I convinced that this cognitive, perceptual, affective, imaginative undertaking we call aesthetic education can alter the atmosphere in schools. I am convinced it must become central if our schools are to become truly educative, stimulating and challenging in the way most of us want them to be (p. 46-47).

Schubart (1972) also provided an excellent argument for why aesthetic education should be included in the school curriculum. By providing opportunities to study art and engage with it, a students’ education becomes more comprehensive and therefore, the student also emerges as a more well-rounded individual,
One of the major goals of American education is to give young people the opportunity to encounter at least the very basic elements of virtually every area of human knowledge and understanding. Young people are required to study mathematics, the sciences, history, languages, not because they are necessarily to become mathematicians, scientists, historians, linguistics, but in order to present them with an opportunity to taste and experience enough so that they can make an informed choice or decision as to whether and how far to pursue these subjects (p. 14).

Once students have explored and studied all areas, including the arts, they can decide how it will affect their future.

**LCI teaching artist.** Lincoln Center Institute had three tiers of influence in its creation and design: Mark Schubart, Maxine Greene and the group of initial teaching artists. Together Schubart and Greene created and developed the foundations of the Institute; Schubart was the administrator and Greene was the educator. However, Noppe-Brandon articulated that it was the teaching artists that were key to LCI’s success (personal communication, December 13, 2013). He indicated that from the beginning of the institute, teaching artists were the direct link between the theory of aesthetic education and the practice of it.

A teaching artist (TA) is an artist who is hired by a cultural institution to teach in schools. At LCI, teaching artists work with students in a series of lessons before they see a work of art. The lessons are designed to engage students in thinking about specific aspects regarding the artwork. For example, one lesson might ask students to use their imaginations as they explore unique scenarios. Another lesson could involve students collaboratively discovering one aspect of how the work of art was made. Yet another lesson might encourage students to physically create a portion of a dance, a song or a play. The following is an account of what one teacher experienced during a workshop with an LCI dance teaching artist:
Imagine seeing a dancer perform a ten-minute, word-less scenario from Flaubert’s “Madame Bovary.” She then instructs you to write a brief monologue of what she might have been saying if she had used words rather than dance. Transform this monologue into a poem. Choose one powerful word in your poem. Develop a body movement or dance sequence that expresses the meaning of that word. Perform that word for others. Choreograph that word with others (May, 1978, p. 4).

The teaching artist directs this sequence so that each activity builds upon the next in order for her students to be affected. May reflects on her experience: “[We] investigated the limitless power and multi-faceted dimensions of language - of feelings and how they might be transformed, transmitted, and communicated in numerous ways” (p. 6). This experience enabled May to bring this kind of detailed aesthetic work to her classroom.

The importance of the teaching artist as a current working artist was paramount in LCI’s implementation of their philosophy. Greene (2001) was a strong advocate for hiring “professionals in the various fields – choreographers, actors, musicians, painters, others more than well-equipped to make accessible the languages, the mysteries of the various art forms” (p. 6). Greene used the word “professionals” when referring to the teaching artists. This distinction was important because LCI understood that only a professional artist, who had several experiences with his chosen craft, could provide his unique perspective about art making to students.

In addition to being professional artists, teaching artists needed to be concerned about affecting change in the students they taught. LCI partnered with a variety of schools. However, many schools were composed of underserved populations. This meant that there was a social justice aspect to being a teaching artist for LCI. Greene advocated for the arts to bridge the gap between students and “to enable as many young people as possible to crack the old forbidding code, to break through artificial barriers that for so long have excluded so many from engaging in aware fashion with the arts”
The aspect of social justice that was inherent in the role of the LCI teaching artist was an added component to an already complex job. Noppe-Brandon spoke highly of LCI teaching artists, while explaining the many tenets of their role:

The role of the LCI TA was unique in the field and therefore it drew the kind of person that was not only able to teach, but teach with aesthetic values. This demanded a lot of the individual. He or she had to teach with LCI’s philosophy in mind, while bringing his or her own style to it. It was not teaching how to do a plié or the difference between high and low space. It was not another gig. It was wanting to make a change (personal communication, December 13, 2013).

This ability of the artist to use his creativity to reach students while at the same time incorporating the larger goals of the institute, mainly principles of aesthetic education, was a large demand. However, Noppe-Brandon believed that LCI employed the “best TAs in the business” (personal communication, January 22, 2014).

In order for an artist to be able to impart his unique knowledge to students, he needed specific training. However, it took LCI some time to develop a formal program for TAs. In the early days, theater Teaching Artist Laurine Towler, remembered her training consisted of a buddy system, when new TAs would shadow more experienced TAs. After observing a few lessons, the new TA would go at it alone (L. Towler, personal communication, January, 14, 2014).

During Noppe-Brandon’s tenure, in the mid 1990s, a training program for teaching artists was developed. It consisted of an eight-day program including different methods of interaction. There were workshops with current teaching artists, lectures on aesthetic theory, practice lessons with peer-generated feedback, and trial lessons with students that also included observation and feedback from school faculty and administrators. The final part of the training consisted of the TA creating an entire unit
based on one work of art to teach to a specific grade level of students.

This program might have been inspired out of Schubart’s discussion of the need for a training program for artists. He was thorough in his evaluation of what artists needed to know how to do when working with students. Schubart (1972) wrote:

Artists need to know how to talk to young people and their parents about their lives as artists; how to elicit from young people the creativity with which they may be endowed; how to apply the insights a young person gains from discovering his own creativity to apprehending the creativity of artists of his own and other times; how to select repertory for presentation to young people and, upon occasion, to create pieces for that purpose; how to perform for young people and how to get young people to perform for him and for his peers (p. 70).

Schubart presents a tall order, but if students were really going to be impacted, teaching artists needed to consider the many facets of their teaching. Noppe-Brandon felt strongly that LCI’s TAs should not rely on their charisma, but needed to understand young people and how to reach them through their art (personal communication, December 13, 2013).

In 1995, Noppe-Brandon created positions for full-time teaching artists at Lincoln Center Institute. He told a story of how he, “woke up one morning and decided that he did not want to run an organization with 110 adjuncts” (personal communication, January 22, 2014). He wanted to make the teaching artist position more of a profession. The full-time TAs were added to the payroll and also given a stipend toward health insurance. Additionally, they were given time off to make art, about 60 days per year. Currently, there are seven full-time TAs and 44 part-time TAs.

The relationship between the teaching artist and the classroom teacher is integral to students receiving an aesthetic education. Collaborative lesson planning allows both teachers to work together in determining what Korn-Bursztyn (2005) called, “the balance between the aims of schools/educational curriculum and the aims of aesthetic education” (p. 51). In preparation for the lesson-planning meeting, both the TA and the teacher have
either seen the work of art live or seen it via video. Laurine Towler, a LCI teaching artist since 1987, described the lesson planning process:

We brainstorm what [the teachers] noticed in the work of art: personal connections, curricular connections, questions raised by it, contextual background they are interested in, and activity ideas. We usually write these categories on large pieces of chart paper on the wall. Then we try to find the key ideas that we will focus on in our lessons. From there we craft a guiding question that all the activities will be based on for the residency. For every lesson the TA does, the teacher will lead one as well. We work these out together. The classroom teachers usually take on the more contextual lessons, so the TA can get the students up on their feet (personal communication, December 23, 2013).

After this meeting, the TA types up the notes and the final lesson plans and sends them to the teacher. In an ideal partnership, the teaching artist and the classroom teacher communicate with each other about the lessons they have taught and adjustments that need to be made along the way.

In conversation about teacher collaboration, John Holyoke, a Senior Program Manager at LCI, acknowledged that LCI knows what the practice is for teaching artists. However, a historically challenging question, which still remains, is “What do teachers do when the TA is not in the room? What is our expectation of what teachers should do on their own” (personal communication, December 11, 2013)? Finding answers to these questions continue to permeate the work of LCI. One possible solution that LCI experimented with early on was the creation of workshops for teachers.

**Summer Session.** In order for teachers to integrate aesthetic education into all their lessons, and not just ones specifically created with a work of art in mind, there needed to be a type of workshop created for them. Schubart (1972) indicated the need for educators to have “a laboratory in which [to] experiment with artists and young people in the development of teaching and learning procedures germane to the educational environment of his own community” (p. 71). Greene (2001) clarified this need, focusing
on teacher training in the facets of aesthetic education. She explained that in order to
teach aesthetically, a teacher must have had aesthetic experiences himself:

> We are hardly in a position to develop a heightened sensitivity in others if we
ourselves do not know what it is like to live inside, to move around within the
range of art forms. And few of us are in a position to communicate what this is
like to others if we who are teachers have not reflected upon our own experiences
with music, dance, theater, and the rest (p. 8).

Once a teacher had participated in aesthetic experiences himself, he would be better able
to create quality aesthetic experiences for his students.

In order to provide these aesthetic experiences for teachers, the founders of LCI
experimented with conducting teacher workshops. At first, they tried holding workshops
afterschool. Naturally, this was not the best choice because many teachers were
exhausted from long days in their classrooms with students. Next, LCI implemented a
teacher workshop in the summer when teachers were on summer vacation. The hope was
that teachers would be able to focus on the workshops because they were not also
teaching at the same time.

The first Summer Session took place in July 1976 (Stamas & Zane, 2007). Forty-
seven teachers from eleven schools gathered at Lincoln Center for three weeks to
immerse themselves in artistic workshops led by institute-trained teaching artists.
Participants also attended live performances of works of art in a variety of genres, which
were shown specifically for them. According to Stamas and Zane after each
performance, the teachers interacted with the artists, the creators, and the designers,
whose work they just watched. Greene (2001) recalled that after teachers witnessed these
performances, “they [could] attend not only cognitively and according to rule, but with
their emotions, their nervous system, their body-minds brought new and in startling
relation to the world (p. 6).
Another aspect of the Summer Session was the lectures given by Greene on a
variety of topics concerning aesthetic education. In one speech, Greene (2001) warned
that teachers must be prepared to work with those new to aesthetic education:

We who are teachers, working with newcomers, cannot but be aware of the
diverse realizations that lie ahead for the works of art we make accessible. At
once, we recognize that the quality and the fullness of those realizations will
depend on the kind of attending we can make possible. So we ponder, the many
ways there are of providing the sorts of experiences we ourselves have had:
experiences that lead to transformations, that open new vistas, that allow for new
ways of structuring the lived world (p. 36-37).

Greene wanted teachers to reflect on their experiences at the Summer Session and bring
those types of lessons to their students during the following school year.

The first Summer Session was a huge success as teachers engaged with art,
encountered aesthetic experiences and learned how to integrate aesthetic education into
their classrooms. There has been a Summer Session every summer since 1976.
Currently, it is called the National Educator Workshop (NEW) and occurs during the
entire month of July, allowing teachers the flexibility to choose their level of
participation. Holyoke said, “Our work really works best when teachers know what it is”
(personal communication, December 11, 2013). Therefore, LCI offers free tuition for
teachers in their partner schools. In addition to the introductory level classes, LCI has
added advanced workshops to the selection of summer offerings, so educators who want
to attend every summer can continually advance their professional development.

Changes for Lincoln Center Institute (1992-2012)

In the summer of 1992, Mark Schubart stepped down as the Executive Director of
Lincoln Center Institute, although he would remain president until 1995. Scott Noppe-
Brandon, who had previously been a Program Director, became the next Executive
Director. On his first day on the job as Executive Director, Noppe-Brandon thought it was important to define the goals of Lincoln Center Institute. In an interview, he recounted writing the three goals of LCI on the white board in his office:

One, to get people to understand the arts; two, to get people to understand their own learning style in relation to how LCI taught about the arts, through aesthetic theory; and three, for teachers and students to understand how to use this knowledge in their everyday lives (personal communication, December 13, 2013).

Underneath the goals he listed the three tools at LCI’s disposal in order to accomplish them: the work of art, the teaching artists, and the partnership with the schools. Noppe-Brandon and his team agreed that the current structure of LCI was insufficient to meet the goals of the institution.

Therefore, Noppe-Brandon and his staff spent years experimenting with programming to determine the best structure to meet the overarching goals of the Institute. He reflected that everything that came out of his time at LCI resulted from the guiding questions: “What is the impact of what we are doing?” and “How deep can we go in our work?” (S. Noppe-Brandon, personal communication, December 13, 2013)

Noppe-Brandon reminisced about how working on finding answers to these questions made his job as Executive Director fun.

In 1992, LCI was given a grant from the Wallace Foundation to do a $3 million, five-year study of LCI. Noppe-Brandon said the study focused on “examining change in student learning, teacher teaching, and school culture as a result of LCI programming” (S. Noppe-Brandon, personal communication, December 13, 2013). The study asked the question, “What is LCI?” Two research groups were hired to work on the study, which was both qualitative and quantitative, Harvard’s Project Zero and faculty from Teachers College, Columbia University.
The results of the study indicated that LCI was a serious educational institution that had tremendous impact. However, according to Stamas and Zane (2007) there were improvements to be made if Lincoln Center Institute wanted to continue being a leader in its field (p. 107). Specifically, four areas needed revised programming. One, the relationship between the teaching artists and the classroom teacher needed strengthening. Two, the creation of Focus Schools would ensure that LCI’s principles of aesthetic education would permeate an entire school community, so that as Holyoke put it, “every grade, every year, every student was involved in LCI” (personal communication, December 11, 2013). Three, the training of TAs was important to ensure that they were reaching as many students as possible in each of the classrooms they taught. Four, work with pre-service teachers (as opposed to in-service) would increase the amount of educators who learned about LCI’s philosophy and could incorporate it in their classrooms.

The study that emerged as a result of The Wallace Foundation grant could be seen as the next evolution of *The Hunting of the Squiggle*. Since Lincoln Center Institute’s formation in 1974, the institute had not been scrutinized with the type of specificity demanded from the Wallace study. Schubart’s study determined the need for a new type of organization to be specifically dedicated to arts education. The study led by Noppe-Brandon evaluated the impact of the programming created by that new organization.

**The Capacities for Imaginative Learning.** In strengthening the relationship between LCI and schools, one difficulty was in school administrators and teachers understanding the value of aesthetic education. Greene (2001) responded to the notion that aesthetic education was a “fringe undertaking, a species of ‘frill’” (p.7). Rather, she
demanded, it was “integral to the development of persons – to their cognitive, perceptual, emotional, and imaginative development” (p. 7). However, in order for educators and administrators to connect with the themes of aesthetic education, LCI began putting the emphasis on “imaginative learning.” The idea was not to discontinue teaching the principles of aesthetic education, but rather to create a different vocabulary for the same theories. According to Noppe-Brandon, LCI needed to make their philosophy about learning practice, not just theoretical or philosophical practice (personal communication, December 13, 2013).

As the conversation about aesthetic education was re-framed to focus on imaginative learning, Holyoke found that more people understood this perspective:

If you ask most Americans if the arts are important they will say yes, but when it comes time to make room for them in the daily schedule, other things become more important. When you ask most Americans if imagination is important, they say absolutely. It is critical. Everybody gets that imagination is a core value in education (personal communication, November 12, 2010).

It was clear, then, that if different terminology was used more educators would understand LCI’s pedagogy of aesthetic education.

In order to define the specific abilities associated with imaginative learning, LCI established the “Capacities for Imaginative Learning” in 2001. They are:

1. **Noticing Deeply**: To identify and articulate layers of detail in a work of art through continuous interaction with it over time.

2. **Embodying**: To experience a work of art through your senses, as well as emotionally, and also to physically represent that experience.

3. **Questioning**: To ask questions throughout your exploration of a work of art that further your own learning; to ask the question, “What if?”

4. **Making Connections**: To connect what you notice and the patterns you
see to your prior knowledge and experiences, as well as to others’ knowledge and experiences, including text and multimedia resources.

5. **Identifying Patterns**: To find relationship among the details you notice in a work of art, group them, and recognize patterns.

6. ** Exhibiting Empathy**: To respect the diverse perspectives of others in our community; to understand the experiences of others emotionally as well as in thought.

7. **Living with Ambiguity**: To understand that issues have more than one interpretation, that not all problems have immediate or clear cut solutions, and to be patient while a resolution becomes clear.

8. **Creating Meaning**: To create your own interpretations based on the previous capacities, see these in the light of others in the community, create a synthesis, and express it in your own voice.

9. **Taking Action**: To try out new ideas, behaviors or situations in ways that are neither too easy, nor too dangerous or difficult, based on the syntheses of what you have learned in your explorations.

10. **Reflecting/Assessing**: To look back on your learning, continually assess what you have learned, assess/identify what challenges remain, and assess/identify what learning needs to happen. This occurs not only at the end of a learning experience, but is part of what happens through that experience. It is also not the end of your learning; it is part of beginning to learn something else

(Lincoln Center Institute, 2012, p. 4).
Although the Capacities initially emerged out of identifying the specific capabilities associated with engaging with a work of art, it turned out that they could be applied to the work in any classroom. Lincoln Center Institute (2012) said about the Capacities, “Our approach is designed to foster and support such meaningful encounters with works of art initially, as this process leads to broader study across subjects” (p. 5). The Capacities took the philosophical ideas of aesthetic education and made them accessible to all teachers, not just arts teachers.

Even though Greene was not a proponent of the Capacities, the principles of aesthetic education, which she originally brought to LCI, were very clearly seen in them. For example, LCI did not want to call the Capacities “skills.” This was because the word “skill” was too rigid and implied that something was either learned or not learned. The word “capacity,” however, meant that there could be many possible levels of understanding and the learning could infinite and inexhaustible, just as Greene taught (Lincoln Center Institute, 2012, p. 4).

**High School For the Arts, Imagination, and Inquiry.** Once the Capacities were created, Noppe-Brandon wanted to further focus the Institute’s work with entire school communities. He reflected that the goal was to “authentically look at the educational impact of the theory of aesthetic education and then make it exist in the world” (personal communication, December 13, 2013). Noppe-Brandon and his team decided that the best way to do this was by starting a school.

For over a year, Noppe-Brandon and his colleagues worked on fleshing out the plans for a New York City public high school. They wrote a position paper for the New York City Department of Education and also one for New Visions for Public Schools, the
company they partnered with in creating the school. Creating a school based on the principles of aesthetic education also honored Greene. In fact, she was a part of the initial team that worked on creating the school. In 2005, the High School for the Arts, Imagination, and Inquiry was founded. It continues to be an LCI Focus School, although it is no longer affiliated with New Visions.

**Teacher Education Collaborative.** Another important initiative begun under Noppe-Brandon’s tenure was the Teacher Education Collaborative (TEC). Noppe-Brandon (2005), recalled an important conversation on his first day at Lincoln Center Institute: “Mark Schubart asked me to take a walk across the Lincoln Center campus. Reaching the bend around Damrosch Park, he turned and spoke the words ‘pre-service education’” (p. xiii). This conversation happened in the summer of 1987, but in the spring of 1993 it would become a reality.

Noppe-Brandon met with Ann Reynolds, who at the time was the chancellor of The City University of New York and also a member of LCI’s Board of Directors. According to Holzer (2005), Reynolds “agreed that the inclusion of LCI’s work in the education of new teachers could help bring the arts back into New York City’s public schools” (p. 6). It was decided that there would be a pilot program at Brooklyn College School of Education. When this collaboration proved to be successful, partnerships with other schools were established. These included: Hunter College, Queens College, Lehman College, City College, St. John’s University, Bank Street College of Education, Teacher’s College, Columbia University, and Stern College for Women, Yeshiva University. Holyoke, who currently works with higher education institutions, described the importance of these partnerships: “if we can reach one pre-service teacher fully,
ideally we’ve just succeeded with thirty or more children” (personal communication, December 11, 2013).

**Emergent Directions for Lincoln Center Education (2012-Present)**

In September 2012, Russell Granet became the Executive Director of Lincoln Center Institute. He was charged with the task of, as he put it, “reimagining what education could be a Lincoln Center” (personal communication, January 29, 2014). Granet felt the work at LCI was “extraordinary,” but it had not been studied in years. He said schools today are very different: “The poverty rate is much higher, teacher training is different, there is pressure on teachers around high stakes testing. How do you re-think what we do to fit a current 21st century model” (personal communication, January 29, 2014)?

To begin answering this question, Granet met with each staff member at LCI individually and they also went on a group retreat. The focus of the retreat was to determine “what the world’s largest performing arts center should do with arts education in today’s world” (Lincoln Center Education, 2014, retrieved from http://www.lcinstitute.org/news/392-nyt-on-4-million-grant-to-ice). They discovered, as Holyoke put it, that LCI needed to be “zoomed out” to incorporate all of the education initiatives that were associated with Lincoln Center (personal communication, December 11, 2013). Programs such as “Meet the Artist” and “Lincoln Center Local” were not a part of LCI, but they were connected to Lincoln Center. This made the educational programming at Lincoln Center confusing, and also meant that there were larger populations to serve through Lincoln Center’s education department.

In order to clarify that the educational component of Lincoln Center was indeed
about education, it was decided to re-name the organization, Lincoln Center Education. Granet felt “the name Lincoln Center Institute was misleading” and that “people often thought it was a physical place that did research” (Agovino, 2013, retrieved from http://www.crainsnewyork.com/article/20131008/ARTS/131009890). Holyoke said that the new name was also about finding a way to “present ourselves as quickly and clearly as possible to as many people as possible” (personal communication, December 11, 2013).

In an effort to be transparent about the purpose of Lincoln Center Education, Granet and his colleagues created a Value Proposition Statement. It emphasizes:

The arts cultivate a unique skill set that is indispensable for the 21st century: problem solving, collaboration, communication, imagination, and creativity. Lincoln Center, the world’s premier performing arts center, translates those skills from the stage to the lives of children, equipping them for success in their careers and to serve as active participants in their communities. We offer a distinctive approach to education that helps young minds perform in a dynamic world (Lincoln Center Education, 2013, LCE pamphlet material).

This statement can be seen as the next iteration of the Capacities for Imaginative Learning. It highlights the skills gained from engaging with the arts as seen through a 21st century perspective. It also stays true to the notion that students do not need to learn the specific techniques of the various art forms in order for them to have a profound affect in their lives.

Going one step further, LCE adds that the unique skills gained from studying the arts will bring positive change in students, which will also affect their communities. In an interview soon after Granet came to Lincoln Center, he discussed this idea, providing a foreshadowing of the work to be done by Lincoln Center Education. Granet told Doherty that arts education “enlists students to become full citizens” and “helps keep kids in school, changing their entire perception of learning” (2012, p. 32). Affecting social
change through providing access to the arts for students is a key component of Lincoln Center Education.

Lincoln Center Education was given a $4 million grant from the Sherman Fairchild Foundation, which helped the organization refine and increase their programming. As a result, one of the newest initiatives at Lincoln Center Education is called “Arts in the Middle.” The program seeks to provide arts programming and teacher training to high-need middle schools that are underserved in arts education (Lincoln Center Education, 2013). John Holyoke noted that this was the first time Lincoln Center was targeting challenging schools outright (personal communication, December 11, 2013).

Another new program, made possible by the Sherman Fairchild grant, is intended to work with students with Autism. LCE has commissioned a theater piece by Trusty Sidekick Theater Company, which focuses on the needs of this population. Lincoln Center Education is also including community initiatives in their programming. Lincoln Center Local presents works of art at various locations in different communities, including libraries, shelters, senior centers and to incarcerated youth.

In the new organization, Lincoln Center Institute has been refocused to be “a dedicated institute within LCE for research in arts education and training for educators using an art-based teaching model” (Lincoln Center Education, 2014, retrieved from http://www.lcinstitute.org/news/392-nyt-on-4-million-grant-to-lce). Holyoke discussed that LCI will become focused on advocacy and draw upon the work that is being done in LCE’s programming areas. For example, LCE is currently doing research with the CUNY faculty and inquiry work in LCE Focus Schools. “The hope is that all of this
work can come together in a totally codified crossroads department at LCE” (personal communication, December 11, 2013).

Lincoln Center Education will also continue sharing its expertise in arts education and creative learning through their consultancies with schools, school districts, cultural organizations, and corporate clients throughout the country and around the world (Lincoln Center Education, 2013, LCE pamphlet material). One recent LCE consultancy was with the National Arts Council of Singapore. Jessica Handrik, LCE Director of Educational and Community Partnerships, spoke about this collaboration:

What we have to offer is a specific, effective model. Their philosophy is closely aligned with ours. They want to build a similar pedagogy, which doesn’t solely focus on an arts course in schools, but pertains to the integrations of the arts in general education. They want to understand our philosophy and see how it is implemented in various fields: professional development, work in the classroom, and arts education advocacy on a policy level (Lincoln Center Education, 2013, retrieved from http://www.lcinstitute.org/news/393-singapore-consultancy).

This consultancy represents an ideal partnership because LCE was able customize their services to meet the needs of the client. Although LCE is a new organization, it encompasses a strong tradition of nearly forty years of arts education, aesthetic education and imaginative learning. Because of this history, LCE is an expert in the field of arts education, and is able to offer a range of services to a variety of clients.

Conclusion

After first discovering Lincoln Center Institute in a workshop for teachers, the author was incredibly fascinated by the idea that arts education did not necessarily mean teaching the technique of a specific art form. Rather, the goal was to teach students how to think like an artist by engaging him in meaningful, hands-on activities. After this initial introduction to LCI, it became essential to understand how an educational organization of this kind developed. In the process of researching this nearly 40-year
history, the growth and changes concerning the educational component of Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts were revealed.

In 1956, the creation of Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts was revolutionary. No other arts institution like it existed anywhere, and its formation required the hard work and dedication of many people. In 1974, Lincoln Center Institute emerged as a unique educational organization within Lincoln Center. In the same way that Lincoln Center was the first full-scale arts center ever developed, Lincoln Center Institute was the first arts education institution dedicated to the teaching and learning of young people in relation to the arts.

Today, Lincoln Center Education is carrying on the mission of Lincoln Center Institute. However, LCE has re-defined this mission and created new programming to accommodate the needs of today’s students. One of LCE’s most important tasks remains in broadening their audience and increasing access to the arts for students and families that would otherwise not have the opportunity to experience them. The education that LCE promotes is essential for all students because the skills gained from thinking like an artist transfer to every aspect of a person’s life. Because of this, LCE believes the arts can change students’ lives. Time will tell how Lincoln Center Education makes its mark on the world of arts education. One thing for sure, however, is that the rich history of the Student Program and Lincoln Center Institute will remain part of Lincoln Center’s newest education initiative.
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January 23, 2014

Ashely Eichbauer
609 Madison Street, Unit C
Hoboken, NJ 07030

Dear Ms. Eichbauer,

I am writing to inform you that Lincoln Center Education grants you permission to investigate and write about the organization for the purposes of your integrative Masters' Project at Bank Street College of Education. It is my understanding that this project is for the purposes of meeting Bank Street College requirements only.

Please submit a final copy to John Holyoke for our records and best of luck with your research.

Best,

Russell Granet
January 23, 2014

Ashely Eichbauer  
609 Madison Street, Unit C  
Hoboken, NJ 07030

Dear Ms. Eichbauer,

I am writing to inform you of my permission to use my name in your study about Lincoln Center Education. You have my permission to use my comments from personal interviews and email correspondence. I understand that your study is for the requirement of the Integrative Master’s Project at Bank Street College of Education.

Sincerely

[Signature]

John Holyoke  
Senior Program Manager, Educational Partnerships  
Lincoln Center Education  
212.875.5353  
LincolnCenterEducation.org
January 13, 2014

Ashley Eichbauer
609 Madison Street, Unit C
Hoboken, NJ 07030

Dear Ms. Eichbauer,

I am writing to inform you of my permission to use my name in your study about Lincoln Center Institute. Additionally, you are given permission to use my comments from our personal interview and email correspondence. I understand that your study is for the requirement of the Integrative Master’s Project at Bank Street College of Education.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Scott Noppe-Brandon
Co-Founder/Director, Squiggle Consulting LLC
President, EmaginationEd, Inc.
January 13, 2014

Ashley Eichbauer
609 Madison Street, Unit C
Hoboken, NJ 07030

Dear Ms. Eichbauer,

I am writing to inform you of my permission to use my name in your study about Lincoln Center Institute. Additionally, you are given permission to use my comments from personal interviews and email correspondence. I understand that your study is for the requirement of the Integrative Master’s Project at Bank Street College of Education.

Sincerely,

Laurine Towler
Theatre Teaching Artist, Lincoln Center Education